

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

### 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-3, 8-10, 15, and 17-18 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being obvious over Yu (U.S. Pat. No. 6,247,749) in view of Brickman (U.S. Pat. No. 4,177,737). The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, *claim 1 was amended to include the limitations of claim 5, which was deemed allowable* in the office action dated November 3, 2006. Claim 5 was canceled, and the remaining claims 2-3 and 6-10 are directly or indirectly dependent on amended claim 1 and should therefore also be allowable.


With respect to claim 15, the applicant *amended claim 15 to include limitations with regard to coupling the cross brace to the leg and support rod in a manner substantially identical to the limitation of claim 6 (which was also deemed allowable)*. As neither Yu nor Brickman teach or suggest such manner of coupling, let alone use of support rods that are coupled via cross braces as presently claimed, claim 15 and dependent claims 17-20 should be allowable.

The applicant believes that the present claim amendments are sufficient to overcome the Examiner's concerns and believes that the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

RUTAN & TUCKER

By

  
Martin Fessenmaier, Ph.D.  
Reg. No. 46,697  
Tel.: (714) 641-5100